

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE:

DOUG LONGHINI,

Plaintiff,

v.

MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES,  
LLC D/B/A KINGS CREEK SHOPPING  
PLAZA and KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE  
WALL LLC D/B/A HOLE IN THE WALL,

Defendants.

---

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated mobility-impaired individuals (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), sues MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC D/B/A KINGS CREEK SHOPPING PLAZA and KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC D/B/A HOLE IN THE WALL (hereinafter “Defendants”), and as grounds alleges:

**JURISDICTION, PARTIES, AND VENUE**

1. This is an action for injunctive relief, a declaration of rights, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.*, (the “Americans with Disabilities Act” or “ADA”) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

2. The Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a).

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and may render declaratory judgment on the existence or nonexistence of any right under 42

U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.*

4. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, is an individual over eighteen years of age, with a residence in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and is otherwise *sui juris*.

5. At all times material, Defendant, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC, owned and operated a commercial shopping center located at 8100 SW 81<sup>st</sup> Drive, Miami, Florida 33143 (hereinafter the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida. Defendant, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC, holds itself out to the public as “KINGS CREEK SHOPPING PLAZA.”

6. At all times material, Defendant, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company, organized under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida.

7. At all times material, Defendant, KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC, owned and operated a commercial sports bar located at 8002 SW 81<sup>st</sup> Drive, Miami, Florida 33143 (hereinafter the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida. Defendant, KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC, holds itself out to the public as “HOLE IN THE WALL.”

8. At all times material, Defendant, KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company, incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida.

9. Venue is properly located in the Southern District of Florida because Defendants’ Commercial Property is located in Miami-Dade County, Florida, Defendants regularly conduct

business within Miami-Dade County, Florida, and because a substantial part(s) of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. Although nearly thirty (30) years have passed since the effective date of Title III of the ADA, Defendants have yet to make its facilities accessible to individuals with disabilities.

11. Congress provided commercial businesses one and a half years to implement the Act. The effective date was January 26, 1992. In spite of this abundant lead-time and the extensive publicity the ADA has received since 1990, Defendants continue to discriminate against people who are disabled in ways that block them from access and use of Defendants' businesses and properties.

12. The ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in 28 CFR 36.201 and requires landlords and tenants to be liable for compliance.

13. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, is an individual with disabilities as defined by and pursuant to the ADA. DOUG LONGHINI uses a wheelchair to ambulate. DOUG LONGHINI has very limited use of his hands and cannot operate any mechanisms which require tight grasping or twisting of the wrist. He also has a great deal of trouble walking or otherwise ambulating without the use of a wheelchair. He is limited in his major life activities by such, including but not limited to walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

14. Defendant, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC, owns, operates and/or oversees the Commercial Property, its general parking lot and parking spots specific to the business therein, that are the subject of this Action.

15. Defendant, KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC, owns, operates and/or

oversees their respective businesses, located within the Defendant's Commercial Property, located in Miami, Florida, that is the subject of this Action.

16. Mr. Longhini is a staunch advocate of the ADA. Since becoming aware of his rights, and their repeated infringement, he has dedicated much of his life to this cause so that he, and others like him, may have full and equal enjoyment of public accommodations without the fear of discrimination and repeated exposure to architectural barriers in violation of the ADA.

17. He is often frustrated and disheartened by the repetitiveness of the complaints he is forced to make to employees and management at different places of public accommodation over thirty (30) years after the legislation of the ADA, to no avail. Mr. Longhini is accordingly of the belief that the only way to affect change is through the mechanisms provided under the ADA.

18. The individual Plaintiff visits the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, to include a visit to the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property on or about November 17, 2022 and encountered multiple violations of the ADA that directly affected his ability to use and enjoy the Commercial Property and businesses located therein. He often visits the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered there, and because it is approximately nine (9) miles from his residence, and is near other businesses and restaurants he frequents as a patron. He plans to return to the Commercial Property and the businesses located within the Commercial Property within two (2) months of the filing of this Complaint, in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered at the place of public accommodation and check if it has been remediated of the ADA violations he encountered.

19. The Plaintiff found the Commercial Property, and the businesses located within the

Commercial Property to be rife with ADA violations. The Plaintiff encountered architectural barriers at the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property and wishes to continue his patronage and use of each of the premises.

20. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers that are in violation of the ADA at the subject Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property. The barriers to access at the Commercial Property, and the businesses located within the Commercial Property have each denied or diminished Plaintiff's ability to visit the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, and have endangered his safety in violation of the ADA. The barriers to access, which are set forth below, have likewise posed a risk of injury(ies), embarrassment, and discomfort to Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, and others similarly situated.

21. Defendants, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC and KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC, own and/or operate a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. Defendants, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC and KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC, are responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that Defendants, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC and KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC, own and operate the Commercial Property located at 8100 SW 81<sup>st</sup> Drive Miami, Florida 33143.

22. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property and the businesses located within the Commercial Property,

including but not necessarily limited to the allegations in Counts I through II of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property and businesses located therein, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property are in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

23. Defendant, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC, as landlord and owner of the Commercial Property, are responsible for all ADA violations listed in Counts I through II.

24. Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, but not necessarily limited to the allegations in Counts I through II of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, and businesses within the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property and businesses within the Commercial Property, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property are in compliance with the ADA,

so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

25. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.

**COUNT I – ADA VIOLATIONS**  
**AS TO MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC**

26. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 25 above as though fully set forth herein.

27. Defendants, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC, have discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Parking

- i. The plaintiff had difficulty accessing the facility, as there are sections without designated accessible parking spaces. Violation: Accessible parking spaces are not dispersed and located closest to accessible entrances, violating Section 4.6.2 of the ADAAG and Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The plaintiff had difficulty accessing the facility, as there are designated accessible parking spaces located too far from an accessible route to the facility. Violation: Some of the

accessible parking spaces are not located on the shortest route to an accessible entrance, violating Section 4.6.2 of the ADAAG and Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- iii. There are accessible parking spaces that do not provide signs designating them as accessible, violating Section 4.6.4 of the ADAAG and Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking spaces are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking spaces located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking space access aisles are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking space access aisles located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. Entrance Access and Path of Travel

- i. The plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it was not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes from the public sidewalk and transportation stop. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(1), 4.3.8, 4.5.1, and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.1, 302.1, 303, and 402.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel due to abrupt changes in level. Violation: There are vertical changes in levels of greater than ½ inch, violating Sections



4.3.8 and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 303 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- iii. There are objects on the path of travel that protrude more than the maximum allowable, violating Section 4.4.1 of ADAAG and Section 307.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it was not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes between sections of the facility. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(2), 4.3, and 4.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.2, 303, 402 and 403, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as there are cross slopes in excess of 2%. Violation: The path of travel contains excessive cross slopes in violation of Section 4.3.7 of the ADAAG and Section 403.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vi. The plaintiff had difficulty using ramps, as they are located on an excessive slope. Violation: Ramps at the facility contain excessive slopes, violating Section 4.8.2 of the ADAAG and Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vii. The plaintiff had difficulty using the elevator without assistance, as the car control buttons are too high. Violation: The elevator car control buttons are mounted higher than 54” and they don’t have the required features, violating Section 4.10.12 of the ADAAG and Sections 308, 309.4, & 407.4.6 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- viii. The plaintiff had difficulty entering tenant spaces without assistance, as the door hardware requires tight grasping and twisting of the wrist to operate. Violation: The tenant entrance doors have non-compliant hardware for disabled patrons, violating Section 4.13.9 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4 and 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

C. Access to Goods and Services

- i. There is seating provided at the facility that does not comply with the standards prescribed in Section 4.32 of the ADAAG and Sections 226 & 902 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. There are drinking fountains that don't provide access to those who have difficulty bending or stooping. Violation: There are drinking fountains that are in violation of Section 4.1.3(10) of the ADAAG and Sections 211.2 & 602.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

D. Public Restrooms

- i. There are permanently designated interior spaces without proper signage, violating Section 4.1.3(16) and 4.30 of the ADAAG and Sections 216.2 and 703 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The plaintiff could not exit the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering clearance is not provided. Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- iii. The plaintiff was exposed to a cutting/burning hazard because the lavatories outside the accessible toilet compartment have pipes that are not properly insulated. Violation: The lavatory pipes are not fully insulated outside the accessible toilet compartment violating Section 4.19.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 213.3.4 & 606.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The plaintiff could not use the lavatory outside the accessible toilet compartment without assistance, as the required knee clearance is not provided. Violation: There are lavatories outside the accessible toilet compartment that don't provide the required clearances violating Section 4.19.2 & Figure 31 of the ADAAG and Sections 213.3.4, 306.3, & 606.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The plaintiff had difficulty using the paper towels due to the roll not being located within a dispenser. Violation: Elements in the restroom are not readily accessible and usable by persons with disabilities, violating 28 CFR 36.211, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vi. The plaintiff could not enter the accessible toilet compartment without assistance, as the required maneuvering clearance is not provided. Violation: The accessible toilet compartment does not provide the required latch side clearance at the door violating Sections 4.13.6 and 4.17.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 404.2.4 and 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vii. The plaintiff could not use the toilet compartment without assistance, as one of the required size is not provided: Violation: The toilet compartments provided for public use at the facility are in violation of Section 4.17.3 and Figure 30(a) of the ADAAG and Section 604.8.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- viii. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the rear grab bar is missing and the side grab bar is not the required length. Violation: The grab bars in the accessible toilet compartment do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Section 4.17.6 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.5 and 609 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ix. The plaintiff could not use the toilet paper dispenser without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required location. Violation: The toilet paper dispenser in the accessible toilet compartment is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.17.6 and Figure 30(d) of the ADAAG and Section 604.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- x. The plaintiff had difficulty using the toilet without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required distance from the side wall. Violation: The water closet in the accessible toilet compartment is mounted at a non-compliant distance from the wall in violation of Section 4.17.3 and Figure 30(a) of the ADAAG and Section 604.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xi. The plaintiff could not use the coat hook without assistance, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are coat hooks provided for public use in the restroom, outside the reach ranges prescribed in Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.6, and 4.25.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 308 and 604.8.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**COUNT II – ADA VIOLATIONS**  
**AS TO MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC**  
**and KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC**

28. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through

25 above as though fully set forth herein.

29. Defendants, MAJORCA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC and KINGS CREEK HOLE IN THE WALL LLC, have discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Entrance Access and Path of Travel

- i. The plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel due to abrupt changes in level.

Violation: There are vertical changes in levels of greater than ½ inch, violating Sections 4.3.8 and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 303 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. Access to Goods and Services

- i. There is seating provided at the facility that does not comply with the standards prescribed in Section 4.32 of the ADAAG and Sections 226 & 902 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The plaintiff could not utilize the bar counter, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are bar counters that are not at the prescribed height, violating Section 4.32.4 and 5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 902.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

C. Public Restrooms

- i. The plaintiff could not exit the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering

clearance is not provided. Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- ii. The plaintiff was exposed to a cutting/burning hazard because the lavatory pipes are not wrapped. Violation: The lavatory pipes are not fully wrapped or insulated violating Section 4.19.4 of the ADAAG and Section 606.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The plaintiff could not use the mirror, as it is mounted too high. Violation: The mirrors provided in the restrooms are in violation of the requirements in Section 4.19.6 of the ADAAG and Section 603.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the side grab bar is not at the required location. Violation: The grab bars do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Section 4.16.4 & Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Section 604.5.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The plaintiff could not use the hand dryer without assistance, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are hand dryers provided for public use in the restrooms that are outside the ranges prescribed in Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.6, and 4.27.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 308 & 309.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

### **RELIEF SOUGHT AND THE BASIS**

30. The discriminatory violations described in Counts I through II are not an exclusive list of the Defendants' ADA violations. Plaintiff requests an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts

violating the ADA and barriers to access in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff further requests to inspect any and all barriers to access that were concealed by virtue of the barriers' presence, which prevented Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, from further ingress, use, and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Business and businesses located within the Commercial Property; Plaintiff requests to be physically present at such inspection in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief. The remediations for the ADA violations listed herein are readily achievable.

31. The individual Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities privileges, benefits, programs and activities offered by Defendants, Defendants' buildings, businesses and facilities; and has otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendants because of the Defendants' ADA violations as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, The Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief.

32. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of its place of public accommodation or commercial facility, in violation of 42

U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR 36.302 et seq. Furthermore, Defendants continue to discriminate against Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

33. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, will suffer irreparable harm, and has a clear legal right to the relief sought. Further, injunctive relief will serve the public interest and all those similarly situated to Plaintiff. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses from Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

34. Defendants are required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for their place of public accommodation. The Plaintiff and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, The Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

35. Notice to Defendants is not required as a result of the Defendants' failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiff



or waived by the Defendant.

36. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to alter the property where Defendants operate their businesses, located at and/or within the commercial property located at 8100 SW 81<sup>st</sup> Drive, Miami, Florida 33143, the exterior areas, and the common exterior areas of the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to The Plaintiff and all other mobility-impaired persons; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendants cure the violations of the ADA.

WHEREFORE, The Plaintiff, DOUG LONGHINI, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue (i) a Declaratory Judgment determining Defendants at the commencement of the subject lawsuit were and are in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.; (ii) Injunctive relief against Defendants including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facilities; or to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require Defendants to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services; (iii) An award of attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and (iv) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: December 14, 2022.

**GARCIA-MENOCAL & PEREZ, P.L.**

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

350 Sevilla Avenue, Suite 200

Coral Gables, FL 33134

Telephone: (305) 553-3464

Facsimile: (305) 553-3031

Primary E-Mail: [ajperez@lawgmp.com](mailto:ajperez@lawgmp.com)

Secondary E-Mails: [bvirus@lawgmp.com](mailto:bvirues@lawgmp.com)

[dperaza@lawgmp.com](mailto:dperaza@lawgmp.com)

By: /s/ Anthony J. Perez

ANTHONY J. PEREZ

Florida Bar No.: 535451

BEVERLY VIRUES

Florida Bar No.: 123713